DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 304 181 JC 890 101

AUTHOR	McHargue, Michael
TITLE	Incentives for Improving Undergraduate Teaching in the California Community Colleges. A Report to the Chancellor's Office on Assembly Concurrent Resolution (ACR) 39, Hayden.
INSTITUTION	California Community Colleges, Sacramento. Academic Senate.; California Community Colleges, Sacramento. Board of Governors.
SPONS AGENCY	California Community Coll. Fund for Instructional Improvement.
PUB DATE	25 Jan 89
NOTE	25p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Budgeting; *Competence; Faculty; Faculty College Relationship; *Faculty Development; Faculty Evaluation; Faculty Recruitment; *Governance; Governing Boards; Incentives; *Instructional Improvement; State Government; *State Legislation; *Teaching Skills; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

This report details the response of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges to Assembly Concurrent Resolution (ACR) Number 39 (Hayden), known as "Incentives for Improving Undergraduate Teaching." Part 1 provides the background and recent history of community college faculty development. Part 2 describes the current faculty development situation with the initial infusion of funds from Assembly Bill (AB) 1725. Part 3 discusses the planned increases in support for the next few years, and part 4 contains specific responses to the four requests in ACR 39. These responses indicate that: (1) the fact that quality instruction is the primary mission of California's community colleges is reflected in job descriptions, and the focus on job applicants' teaching competency in letters of recommendation and job interviews; (2) the initial funding provided by AB 1725 resulted in a 25% increase of $5 million for staff and faculty development in the community colleges, while proposals for fiscal year 1989-90 requested an increase to approximately $10 million; (3) the Board of Governors is working carefully to suggest incentives, provide resources, guide local decisions, and assure appropriate evaluations of its incentives to improve teaching; and (4) while $20 million of "new" Staff and Faculty Development Funds would be needed each year to run a competent and professional faculty development program in the California community colleges, $70 million annually is needed to fully fund the goals of ACR 39. (AJL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED304181

INCENTIVES FOR IMPROVING UNDERGRADUATE TEACHING in the CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

A Report to the Chancellor's Office
on
Assembly Concurrent Resolution (ACR) 39, Hayden

In Partial Fulfillment
of a
Fund for Instructional Improvement (FII) Grant
Which Was Co-Sponsored by the Academic Senate/CIO

by

Dr. Michael McHargue

January 25, 1989

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Smith

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

JC 890 101

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INCENTIVES FOR IMPROVING UNDERGRADUATE TEACHING
in the
CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

CONTENTS

Executive Summary i

I. Background and Recent History 1

II. The Current Situation -- January 1989 8

III. Proposed Increases in Support 10

IV. Summary and Response to ACR 39 12

Acknowledgements 15

Attachments 17

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Assembly Concurrent Resolution (ACR) Number 39 (Hayden)[1], "Incentives for Improving Undergraduate Teaching," was filed with the California Secretary of State on September 14, 1987. It requested the governing boards of the three public postsecondary segments in California to adopt and enforce policies and incentives for improving teaching and to report to the legislature the action taken toward, and the costs associated with, full implementation.

This document is the Board of Governors for California Community Colleges response to ACR 39. It was produced through a Chancellor's Office Fund for Instructional Improvement (FII) Grant - Part B - the projects that are designed to explicitly carry out the Board of Governors' highest priorities. It was co-sponsored by the Academic Senate and the Chief Instructional Officers of the California Community Colleges. It was written by Dr. Michael McHargue of Foothill College, Chair of the Faculty Development Committee of the Academic Senate, with the crucial assistance of the sponsoring organizations, the Chancellor's staff, and the many people and organizations noted in the Acknowledgements.

Part One provides the background and recent history of community college faculty development; Part Two describes the current faculty development situation with the initial infusion of AB 1725 funding; Part Three discusses the planned increases in support for the next few years; and Part Four contains the summary and responses to ACR 39.

The California Community Colleges are, first and foremost, *teaching* institutions. After a decade of very limited fiscal support, the passage of AB 1725 has begun to provide the financial resources they need to assure that the faculty development systems which support their primary mission will be improved substantially.

ACR 39 acknowledged the community colleges' commitment to teaching excellence by omission when it did *not* require us to assure the Legislature that *teaching quality* is *the* primary criterion for hire, retention, promotion and tenure. ACR 39 also acknowledged that our flexibility in faculty and departmental staffing mechanisms are appropriate to meet changing student needs. But the resolution did require responses to four requests also made of the governing boards of University of California and the California State Universities -- they requested the Board of

[1] (Numbers refer to Attachments)

Governors of the California Community Colleges to:

1) "...adopt policies and procedures to assure that new faculty demonstrate competency in classroom teaching prior to entry into the classroom...,"
2) "...(assure) that resources are made available to faculty members to assist them in improving their teaching performance...,"
3) "...establish appropriate incentives for improving teaching apart from the personnel process for retention, promotion, and tenure," and
4) "submit reports to the educational policy and fiscal committees of the Legislature describing the actions taken to comply with this resolution and the costs associated with its full implementation."

Our responses, using corresponding numbers, follow:

1) Since quality instruction is *the* primary mission of our 107 colleges, they all make that clear in their faculty job descriptions, they solicit evidence of it in their letters of recommendation, and they try to assure it in their job interviews. In fact, almost all colleges now use a "teaching sample" as part of their interview process to confirm a candidate's instructional skills. These policies and procedures are so central to each college's mission and confirmed so clearly through the Chancellor's consultation process, that the Board of Governors has not had to introduce any new regulations to assure that they are followed. Board support for staff development is currently implied but it is made explicit in Chancellor's Office memos and requirements. As the current increase in financial support evolves, formal new statewide policies and procedures may be developed.

   Major new faculty hiring requirements have been mandated by AB 1725, the Community College Reform legislation[2]. They include the abolition of credentials, establishment of minimum hiring standards, setting of affirmative action goals, and increasing the percentage of classes taught by full-time, contract faculty. The Board of Governors will assure, through appropriate policies, that the community colleges' commitment to hiring excellent teachers will be maintained during this transition.

2) The California Postsecondary Education Commission reported that in 1986-87 the California Community Colleges spent less than 1% of their operating budgets on staff and faculty development -- less than half that mandated by Florida community colleges; even further below that recommended by national and state staff development groups[3,4,5]. However, the initial funding provided by AB 1725 has provided an increase of $5 million for staff and faculty development and $200,000 to augment our Fund for Instructional Improvement in the next six months -- increases of approximately 25% and 40% respectively. Moreover, the Board has authorized Budget Change Proposals to the Department of Finance that would increase these dramatically for Fiscal Year 1989-90 to approximately $10 million for staff and faculty development and almost $7 million for the Fund for Instructional

Improvement -- another major increase in the former and a remarkable ten-fold increase in the latter. The goal noted in the faculty development proposal is to increase the level again in 1990-91 so that the target of 2% of general fund expenditures is reached in that year. This support would constitute a more than doubling of staff and faculty development funds between January 1989 and July 1990, in addition to the large increase in the instructional improvement fund. These professional development funds are categorical -- they must be used to increase staff and faculty development opportunities. The Board has recently sent a memo[6] to each college which provides details on how to qualify for the funds and the appropriate uses for them. Improvement of Teaching is #1 on the list. This memo was augmented by a letter from the Academic Senate and the Chief Instructional Officers[7] which annotated the Board's instructions, described several upcoming faculty development training opportunities, and suggested more than 35 possible uses for the new funds. To sum up: dramatic new resources are being made available to California Community College faculty members to assist them in improving their teaching performance. In doing so, the Board has also complied with recommendations recently made by CPEC to improve undergraduate teaching; to establish a process to better plan, coordinate and evaluate faculty development; and to move toward the goals of assuring that the funding is supplementary and that it rapidly reaches the 2% level.

3) The governance sections of AB 1725 clarified that the California Community Colleges are a *system*, not just a loose confederation of 71 districts and 107 colleges. Nevertheless, important local differences exist and the Board of Governors is working carefully to suggest incentives, to provide resources, to guide local decisions, and to assure appropriate evaluations of its incentives to improve teaching. The Board has done this in a number of ways. It has:

   a) Established the Hayward Award for Faculty Excellence to honor four outstanding faculty each year. This selection, organized through the Academic Senate, has encouraged local college nominations and endorsed further recognition for teaching excellence at the campus level.

   b) Funded the grant that supported this report and which will also provide additional faculty development incentive guidance through memos, workshops, conference presentations, and the development of a statewide Council for Staff Development.

   c) Funded another grant to evaluate the Flex Calendar (Staff Development) Program and other professional development activities as well as to provide more ideas for local incentives for improving teaching.

   d) Listed the authorized uses of the funds in its staff development guidelines. "Improvement of teaching" was first on the list.

e) Listed the general project criteria which the Chancellor's Office and the California Postsecondary Education Commission regard as the highest state priorities. Again, "improving classroom instruction and service to students" topped the list.

f) Supported continued and increasing efforts like those noted in Attachment 7 which will provide more ideas and incentives for local decisions on how to improve teaching.

g) Refunded a grant supporting local and regional Instructional Skills Workshops[8].

4) The three preceding sections have noted the actions taken by the Board of Governors to comply with ACR 39. Both CPEC and AB 1725 have suggested that 2% of each college's general fund budget ought to be spent on staff and faculty development. To reach that level by 1990-91, a total of $40 million would have to be devoted to such work. Under the system currently being developed, that would include $20 million that the colleges would have spent under pre-AB 1725 conditions and an additional $20 million of categorical funding provided by the State through the Chancellor's Office. We consider this $20 million per year of "new" Staff and Faculty Development Funds plus $5 million per year of Fund for Instructional Improvement (FII) grant funds to be the *minimum* needed to run a competent and professional faculty development program.

However, as noted earlier, Staff Development Professionals recommend a 2-5% investment in our human capital. We have more than a decade of serious underfunding and faculty development neglect to make up for and we face a period of unprecedented replacement hiring. As a result, we recommend that an additional $15 million be invested annually in staff and faculty development -- $5 million to augment the competitive grants in the FII up to $10 million, and $10 million to be available on a 1:1 matching basis to individual colleges which wish to go beyond the minimum -- up to the 3% level of their general funds.

As a result, our recommendation for a truly excellent program that would fully fund the goals of ACR 39 would cost $70 million annually -- $30 million from local college general funds, $30 million from state categorical funds, and $10 million for the FII. This level of funding will reverse the years of faculty development neglect and help return the California Community College system to its acknowledged place as the leader among two-year colleges in the United States and abroad.

BACKGROUND AND RECENT HISTORY

The Institutions:

The California Community Colleges are a system of 107 colleges in 71 college districts which are led by a State Chancellor's Office and directed by a Board of Governors. Their roots were in the State's public school/K-12 system more than in the other two public postsecondary institutions -- the University of California and the California State Universities. These are *teaching* institutions which provide the first two years of college education. All of the colleges have an Academic Senate which represents the faculty on professional and academic matters. Most of them have formed faculty unions since the option of collective bargaining was introduced over a decade ago. These unions represent the faculty in areas of wages and working conditions. Both the Academic Senates and the collective bargaining units have a major interest in the faculty development activities for their colleagues.

Most of our colleges do not have the academic ranking typical of other postsecondary institutions. Instead, most of the faculty are called Instructors, and their pay is based on another K-12 legacy -- a salary schedule that is a matrix of professional education and teaching experience. Faculty development typically is closely tied to this salary schedule: instructors must complete professional growth activities (typically, though not exclusively, through taking graduate courses) in order to move to the higher education "columns." They must complete years of successful teaching in order to move to higher levels of the experience "steps." These processes are typically taken very seriously by the faculty and their administrators because it involves remuneration and it involves quality control. Most faculty development activities are set up to improve the quality of instruction and to help instructors to move to higher salary levels.

Instruction is valued highly and evaluated frequently. All colleges emphasize instructional skills when they write their faculty job descriptions and evaluate their job references. Almost all institutions now require a teaching sample (or a similar appropriate professional demonstration for non-teaching faculty, such as counselors, librarians, and student service professionals) as part of their interview process. Teachers are evaluated early and often in their teaching careers. During the current two-year tenure period, their classes are visited frequently by peers and supervisors -- more than ten times at some colleges. Student evaluations are also used frequently. Even after tenure has been earned, faculty are evaluated every two years. There is no question that teaching quality is encouraged, yes, demanded, in the California Community College system.

During the period before 1978, faculty development in the California Community Colleges was typically between 1 and 2% of general fund budgets -- below the level recommended by staff development professionals, but not problematically so. The

major staff development activities were conference and travel support, sabbaticals, innovation development funds, workshops, and the "in-service" meetings typical of K-12.

1978 - Proposition 13:

Just as the passage of AB 1725 is currently ushering in a new era for the California Community Colleges, the earlier passage of the Jarvis-Gann Initiative, Proposition 13, in spring of 1978 ushered in a decade of "bad old days" for community college funding. Staff development was particularly hard hit, as were most other parts of our enterprise that were not directly associated with instruction and the production of ADA and college revenue. At many colleges, sabbaticals were ended or severely limited, travel was cut drastically, innovation funding was slashed, and staff development professionals and programs were terminated or reassigned. We estimate that in the early 1980's, California Community Colleges spent well less than 1/2% of their general fund budgets on staff development. In the past few years, as funding has improved somewhat, so have staff development budgets. A 1987 study determined that our colleges were approaching the 1% funding of staff development -- still less than half of recommended minimums but twice the amount expended during the worst period immediately after Proposition 13.

Recent Faculty Development Programs:

Even though funding was very limited in the last decade, several important faculty development programs were initiated during that period. Three of them began early in the decade:

Flex Calendar Program[9]
This program allows California Community Colleges to use up to 15 days of their state mandated (and K-12 rooted) 175-day teaching year for professional development. This activity, now used by over 40 of our colleges, has resulted in some very innovative, creative, and often relatively inexpensive faculty development activities. This is probably the most important faculty development delivery vehicle in our system, followed by conference and travel and sabbaticals.

California Great Teachers Seminars[10]
These immodestly titled seminars (one needn't declare oneself great...aspirations of greatness are good enough) have provided teaching celebrations and technique swaps for over 500 faculty at the statewide meetings and more than twice that number at local variations. The parent seminar is co-sponsored by the Academic Senate and the California Association of Community Colleges. It has spawned a lengthening list of staff development progeny, including seminars focusing on Senate leadership; "new majority" students and staff; administrative leadership; shared governance; and staff development, in addition to the many local and regional teaching celebrations. Since the seminar has been

oversubscribed for the past several years, we expect to have *two* in 1989, sharing the second one with colleagues from the University of California and the California State Universities.

Fund for Instructional Improvement (FII)[11]
This fund has been able to support innovative instructional programs through competitive proposals for the past ten years. The annual funding level for these grants and loans has varied between $500,000 and $1 million to support projects that have important staff and faculty development components. The FII has always emphasized support for projects that have strong potential to be implemented at other colleges, so its "ripple effect" has been substantial. In the last two years, approximately half of the funds have been devoted to projects that specifically address the top goals and initiatives developed by the California Community College Board of Governors; the other half remained available for competitive bids to develop projects that met local objectives and those of the Fund's initiating legislation.

This is a sample of the FII projects that were recommended for funding in the past two years:

1987-88:
* Revitalizing the Teaching of Literature
* Improving ESL Instruction for College-Bound Students
* Improving the Quality of Teaching by New Part-Time Instructors
* Staff Development Via Interactive Video Teleconferencing
* Computer Assisted Writing Improvement for the Hearing Impaired
* Instructional Applications of Videodisk Technology in the Arts
* Instructional Skills Workshop Program Demonstration Project

1988-89:
* Technology in the Classroom
* Faculty Development Network for Small Rural Colleges
* Basic Skills Instruction Video Series
* Teaching Reading Across the Curriculum
* Cognitive Skills Development Project
* Improving Teaching and Learning Through Classroom-Based Research
* Professional Staff Development
* Teaching Writing Across the Curriculum
* Instructional Skills Workshop Program Implementation

Three more activities with important faculty development potential have appeared in the last three years:

Matriculation[12]. This is a system which follows students from the time they are recruited until well after they have left the institution. It encompasses seven distinct steps: Admissions, orientation, skills assessment and evaluation,

counseling, student progress follow-up, instructional research, and coordination and training. There are many faculty and staff development aspects to this new systematic look at matriculation activities which tend to focus on professional development for non-teaching faculty to improve service to students, and to improve coordination between student services and instruction.

Teaching Resource Centers (TRC)[13]. A second important delivery system for faculty development programs is evolving -- the Teaching Resource Center. These units, often faculty-initiated and housed in the college library, are coming to combine the *services* and *coordination responsibilities* of a staff development office and a *place* which is dedicated to professional development and which hosts many of its services -- talks, seminars, computers, professional library, and faculty development opportunities. Although only a few colleges currently have such centers, several more are in the final planning stages.

Successful Teaching Strategies[14]. The Chancellor's Office has recently published a book with this title and the subtitle "Instruction for Black and Hispanic Students in the California Community Colleges." It has received wide dissemination throughout the State and was recently the subject of a major presentation at the Fall 1988 Session of the Academic Senate. Although its main focus is on improving the teaching strategies used for new majority students, many faculty have recognized that it also has great value for other students as well.

Faculty Development Terminology:

For purposes of this report, we have often used the terms faculty development and staff development interchangeably. Professional development is another commonly used synonym. It is clear that faculty development is a *narrower* term -- focusing on services to one subset (albeit the largest one) of the California Community Colleges' professional staff. Distinguishing between these activities was not possible in this report -- and probably not desirable. Even though ACR 39 requests information on incentives for improving *teaching* (really a *part of* faculty development), such programs are usually imbedded in larger, more comprehensive staff development programs which serve the entire college staff. The importance of this comprehensive set of services was underscored when AB 1725 provided funds for "faculty and staff development" and the Chancellor's Office required advisory committees to include representatives of all professional constituencies. Although this report will continue to focus on the faculty development segments within this broader context, it will not attempt to *isolate* them because to do so would be artificial and would violate the recommendations of most professional development leaders and organizations. They emphasize the importance of comprehensive and coherent professional growth programs. Faculty development in the community colleges does not get cheated in this connection with other programs. Faculty form the largest segment of community college staffs, they usually represent the largest numbers on professional development committees,

and they typically receive the largest share of services and funding. This is all consistent with the "50% Law" in our system, which requires that over one-half of a College's general fund expenditures must be directly related to instruction -- another clear acknowledgement of the centrality of instruction in our mission.

Professional Development Organizations:

Several years ago, most faculty development was organized and provided at the local campus level. Academic Senates (and, later, faculty unions) led many of these efforts. They were joined and supported by administrative units which provided funding to broaden the development through sabbaticals, travel to professional meetings, and convention funds. In the last decade, the need to coordinate professional development efforts has brought about several organizations designed to meet those needs. The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges has provided important services and information through its Faculty Development Committee. The Faculty Association for California Community Colleges supports similar work through its Curriculum and Instruction Committee. Statewide faculty unions have also played an important role in instructional development. The Association of California Community College Administrators has had a very active and effective Management Development Institute and the Association of California Community College Trustees has extended its professional development activities as well. The California Association of Community Colleges provides many opportunities for faculty and staff development through its annual convention and numerous workshops, seminars, and conferences organized and/or co-sponsored by their office.

In recent years, two organizations devoted to comprehensive staff development have grown up in California -- one in the north and one in the south. They have been informal (no by-laws, no officers, etc.) but effective in consistently supporting statewide conferences and in providing advice to local staff developers and state authorities. The recent dramatic increase in professional development activities and funding has led these two groups to support a steering committee, the California Community College Council for Staff Development (4C/SD), to determine the issues involved in whether a statewide organization would be useful and, if so, what form it should take. The Council will present its recommendations to the statewide Staff Development Conference in March and will also co-sponsor a western regional conference of the National Council for Staff, Professional, and Organization Development (NCSPOD) connected to the California conference.

The Professional Development Academy of the California Association of Community Colleges[15] is an important umbrella organization for statewide organizations and representatives of the classified staff and Chancellor's Office. Its members represent ACCCA, CCCT, the Academic Senate, representatives from Northern and Southern Staff Developer Groups, CSEA, the Chancellor's Office, CCCCEO, CPEC, and CACC. It performs the crucial role of helping all the

professional development groups coordinate their efforts, share resources, and ultimately, enhance the service we provide our staffs, faculty and students[16].

Although California has lagged far behind our own standards and goals, as well as the performance of other states, in the past decade, we have still provided important leadership for the national staff development movement. Both the current president and the past-president of NCSPOD are California Community College staff development leaders.

Recent Studies:

The California Community Colleges have not suffered from a dearth of studies in the past few years. While the most comprehensive and publicized of these were conducted by the Master Plan Commission and the Joint Committee of the Legislature, there have been several which focused on faculty development. These reports have been, and will be, very influential in helping "guide" the directions of faculty development into the next century.

In the Budget Act of 1986, the Legislature directed the California Postsecondary Education Commission to "undertake a descriptive study of faculty development programs in California's public colleges and universities in order to clarify State policy and improve State decision making about faculty and staff development programs that have a common goal of improving the quality of instruction by enhancing the knowledge, skills, and motivation of educators and those who serve students in other ways."

CPEC, in turn, commissioned a study by Berman, Weiler Associates to gather data for the CPEC evaluation. Their report "Exploring Faculty Development in Higher Education" was presented to CPEC in December 1987. The Executive Summary and Conclusions are in Attachment 3.

CPEC combined the Berman, Weiler study with its own data to respond to the Legislature in March 1988. The report "State Policy for Faculty Development in Higher Education" provided several recommendations for all three segments of public higher education in California. The Executive Summary, which includes the community college recommendations, is Attachment 4.

Three other recent studies have produced documents that are having a positive impact on the quality of undergraduate teaching in the California Community Colleges:

- California's Faces/California's Future[17] was developed by the Chancellor's Office and the Board of Governors. It is a careful study and projection of the changing demography of our state and our community college students. It offers important information concerning the clients we now serve and those

we will serve in the future and it offers suggestions on how to serve them more effectively.

- Beyond Assessment: Enhancing the Learning and Development of California's Diverse Students[18] is a report compiled by the California Postsecondary Education Commission in response to Assembly Bill 2016: The Talent Development Act of 1987 (Hayden). It discusses the ideas of "Value-Added" and "Talent Development" approaches to Higher Education and looks at quality initiatives to be supported by state incentive funding.

- Indicators and Measures of Institutional Effectiveness[19] is a research/survey report conducted and reported by the Commission on Research of the California Association of Community Colleges. It asked conference participants at the 1987 CACC Fall Convention to identify the key measures of Institutional Effectiveness. The remarkable results underscore the centrality of teaching excellence in our system and the consistency of that belief throughout our educational community. The three top measures were 1) faculty effectiveness, 2) student satisfaction with quality of instruction, and 3) positive faculty/student relationships. More important, they were ranked *in that order* by all four major constituencies that participated in the survey—trustees, administrators, faculty, and students.

THE CURRENT SITUATION - JANUARY 1989

The passage of AB 1725, the Community College Reform Legislation, marks a dramatic watershed in the history of the two-year colleges in California. It moves the Colleges dramatically and clearly into a higher education stance. One of the most powerful changes caused by the Bill is in the area of faculty development. The financial details will be noted later, but they must be viewed in the context of other major changes related to AB 1725 or associated (temporally) with its passage:

1) We have a "new" Board of Governors that was very instrumental in the development of AB 1725 and in securing the Governor's support for it.

2) We have a new Chancellor, David Mertes. He is widely respected throughout the system for his administrative skills, scholarly background, and political savvy.

3) We have a major reorganization of the Chancellor's Office underway. AB 1725 provided permission to add several high level positions in the system which are not subject to civil service rules. This provides the Chancellor with a much greater pool from which to select his top associates.

4) We have made a remarkable commitment to Affirmative Action through AB 1725 -- a set of goals that are not matched anywhere in academe. This commitment, which is closely tied to concurrent funding for a higher percentage of full-time faculty and the expected need to replace a very large number of retiring faculty, will allow the California Community Colleges to add a "new generation" of faculty in the coming decade - perhaps a 50% turnover and one that will allow us to form a professional staff that more closely mirrors the demographic characteristics of the students we serve. The faculty development implications of such a dramatic turnover are profound.

5) We are learning to work together better. The California Community Colleges have been criticized for years for being unclear on their mission and unable to present a common front when dealing with Sacramento. That has changed. AB 1725 has explicitly clarified the mission and its passage was made possible only by the willingness and ability of our diverse constituencies to work together through the Californians to help craft the legislation and gather broad support for it -- in our colleges and in the Legislature.

AB 1725's reforms are staged over a three-phase funding sequence. Most of its measures will not be implemented until $70 million and then a second $70 million are budgeted for them. But the first year returns are in and they demonstrate a wise understanding of how critically important staff and faculty development is. The bill provides $5 million for new professional development in the first six months of 1989. It also augments the Fund for Instructional Improvement by $200,000. These

monies are available now along with clear guidelines on how prepare and qualify for them. They will have a dramatic impact on the quality of instruction in our system and will enable us to document the incentives and changes they have caused.

This is the preliminary list of authorized uses for the staff development funds:

a) Improvement of teaching.
b) Maintenance of current academic and technical knowledge and skills.
c) In-service training for vocational education and employment preparation programs.
d) Retraining to meet changing institutional needs.
e) Intersegmental exchange programs.
f) Development of innovations in instructional and administrative techniques and program effectiveness.
g) Computer and technological proficiency programs.
h) Courses and training implementing affirmative action and upward mobility programs.
i) Other activities determined to be related to educational and professional development pursuant to criteria established by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, including, but not necessarily limited to, programs designed to develop self-esteem.

The general project criteria which the Chancellor's Office and the California Postsecondary Education Commission regard as the highest state priorities are:

a) Improving classroom instruction and service delivery to students.
b) Addressing the needs of changing student populations, especially underrepresented and underprepared students.
c) Advancing faculty and staff affirmative action. (While separate funds have been designated in AB 1725 for affirmative action, any projects funded through the Faculty and Staff Development Fund which would contribute primarily or incidentally to affirmative action should also be pursued and documented.)
d) Integrating faculty and staff development planning with overall institutional research and planning.

Evaluation of the effectiveness of staff development programs will make use of these criteria and authorized uses.

PROPOSED INCREASES IN SUPPORT

There are a number of unknowns related to staff and faculty development in the near future. They include:

1) The passage of Proposition 98, which will have an important fiscal effect on the community colleges. However, it carries with its funding some complications in terms of its *immediate* effect on our system and the concurrent effect on the rest of the California budget.

2) The revenues that the State will have for all its programs. As always, the community colleges will have to compete with the wide range of state needs for funds that have recently been described as $1.5 billion short of the state requirements. The reluctance of the governor and many legislators to raise revenues will likely cause this to be a problem for all community college funding, including that for professional development.

3) Faculty development needs will vary with the implementation of AB 1725. For instance, the major increase in new full-time positions will, when it is triggered, require substantial new investments in *new* faculty services. The change of the tenure process from two to four years will allow us and *require* us to provide faculty assistance and incentives to help our new colleagues become better teachers and earn their tenure.

4) We need to develop better ways to create and disseminate new faculty development ideas such as those noted in Attachment 20. While it is crucial that most staff development plans be made on the local campus, they cannot be made effectively when many of the college personnel don't know what the possibilities are. Some colleges do not have a staff development officer. Most have not had enough recent funding to prepare a well-conceived, long-term professional development plan. Projects like the one that produced this report can be very helpful in providing the "menu" of possibilities to choose from.

5) We must plan ways to provide assistance for professional development that cuts across *all* colleges. Professional organizations (of ESL faculty or Special Education teachers or psychologists, for instance) could provide important incentives and skills for community college teachers; currently the funding is college-based through the Average Daily Attendance (ADA) system.

6) We have to develop better systems to encourage experienced faculty to continue their professional development after they have "maxed out" on the salary schedule. One of the most promising set of incentives now are those in the Foothill-De Anza District's Professional Achievement Awards (PAA) noted in Attachment 21; another is the "Alternate Methods" program

designed by the Coast Community College District. They provide substantial monetary awards for faculty who document their continuing dedication to professional growth and its effect on their teaching.

Part of the proper answer to these unknowns is the infusion of more faculty development funding. The Chancellor's Office for California Community Colleges has prepared two Budget Change Proposals (BCPs) for 1989-90 that, if funded, would move the system a long way toward meeting our staff development needs.

One Budget Change Proposal[22] proposes to increase state awarded faculty and staff funding to $10 million, or approximately 1/2% of fiscal year revenues. This was the amount recommended in AB 1725 but twice that actually funded in 1988-89. That would bring total local staff development expenditures in 1989-90 to around 1 1/2% of their general funds. The BCP further proposes to increase this amount in 1990-91 by enough (approximately $10 million *more*) to bring local expenditures up to 2%, the goal noted in the Berman, Weiler study, the CPEC report, and AB 1725. Funding this BCP would mark a dramatic increase in the support for staff and faculty development in the California Community Colleges, raising them from less than 1% up to 2% of general fund expenditures over a two year period.

As crucial as this increase would be, it does not meet the need. Florida has found 2% to be an acceptable maintenance level for faculty development but they haven't had to make up for the lost decade of Proposition 13 that California will. Florida hasn't had to cope with the major increases in full-time faculty or the massive replacements we must face in the 90's. Moreover, most professional staff and organization groups recommend a 2 to 5% investment in this area. A few colleges already spend more than 2% and would do still more with the proper incentives. If the State were able to offer colleges additional funds on a matching basis, many colleges would participate. One positive suggestion is to assure that all colleges raise their level of staff development funding to 2% - the funding of the plan in the BCP would assure that by 1990-91. Then the system should have an additional $10 million available to award to colleges on a 1:1 matching basis up to 3% of their general fund expenditures.

A second faculty development Budget Change Proposal[23] has been prepared for 1989-90. It proposes to dramatically increase funding from its current annual level of less than one million dollars to $6.75 million. Approximately half of the funds would still be used to support locally-proposed projects to enhance instruction and meet the goals of the Fund. The other half would be used to support special projects that meet the annual system-wide goals and priorities of our Board of Governors. The Fund has proved to be very successful over the last decade despite its very modest cost. Even this BCP would keep the Fund below 1/2% of system income. We recommend that it be raised to that 1/2% level -- approximately $10 million annually.

SUMMARY AND RESPONSE TO ACR 39

Assembly Concurrent Resolution 39 (Hayden), "Incentives for Improving Undergraduate Teaching," was filed in Fall 1987. It requested the three governing boards of the public postsecondary segments of higher education in California to respond to several requests which were designed to strengthen the quality of undergraduate instruction throughout our state.

The Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges responded by sending out a Request For Proposals to conduct an appropriate study and to make recommendations through its Fund for Instructional Improvement. It did so through Part B of the Fund which supports the highest Board of Governors' priorities. A proposal that was co-sponsored by the Academic Senate and the Chief Instructional Officers was selected to prepare the report. Dr. Michael McHargue, Chairman of the Academic Senate Faculty Development Committee and Coordinator of the Foothill College Honors Program, was selected as project director.

The project was conducted through an extensive review of documents related to staff development in the community colleges over the past decade and a series of interviews with people representing all the segments of our community college system—students, faculty, staff, administrators and trustees. The results of those interviews and the literature search were brought together in a draft response which was then reviewed by over 60 staff development and instructional leaders in the California Community College system. They included the Academic Senate Executive Committee and Faculty Development Committee, the Chief Instructional Officers Board of Directors, the CACC Professional Development Academy and the Council for Staff Development as well as the staff development professionals and the Chancellor's Cabinet in our Chancellor's Office. Many of their recommendations were incorporated into the final report.

The report found that the quality of undergraduate teaching in our system is *very good*. We *are* teaching institutions and we *perform* our primary job very well. Nevertheless, there is room for improvement which can be facilitated by improved funding for staff development in the colleges.

The California Community Colleges have been seriously underfunded since the passage of Proposition 13 in 1978. Staff development funding was among the areas that were hit the hardest, falling by about one-half as a percentage of general fund expenditures from almost 2% to less than 1%. According to studies by Berman, Weiler and CPEC, they remained at that lower level until the passage of AB 1725. Those studies also recommended that the system should increase its funding for staff development back to that 2% level.

The Community College reform bill provided $5 million to begin the revitalization of staff development in January 1989. While very welcome, even that major infusion of funding fell far short of the $10 million recommended in its own text and the 2% goal from the earlier studies which it also endorsed.

The California Community College Chancellor's Office prepared two Budget Change Proposals in Fall 1988 to advance us toward full funding of our staff development needs. They recommended we achieve the full 2% level by the 1990-91 academic year (to approximately $40 million) and that we increase the Fund for Instructional Improvement to $6.75 million in 1989-90. This report makes an additional recommendation based on the reports from the instructional and staff development experts in our system, that an additional $10 million of state funds be made available that will allow some colleges to reach a 3% level of funding and that the FII increase go up to $10 million in order to support local campus instructional innovations and statewide Board of Governors' initiatives.

Specifically responding to the four requests in ACR 39:

1) Policies and procedures are already in place at the local campus level to ensure that new faculty demonstrate competency in teaching prior to their entry into the classroom. The system is currently preparing for a 50% turnover in contract faculty by the turn of the century—one which will emphasize the need, noted in AB 1725, to hire instructors who more closely mirror the students they serve. The Board of Governors is committed to excellence in instruction *and* an appropriate Affirmative Action policy and it will ensure classroom competence through appropriate policies and procedures.

2) AB 1725 has already increased the resources available to faculty members to assist them in their teaching performance. It increases staff development funding in the system by more than 25% over that of a year ago. The Board has noted that the top priority for those funds is for the improvement of teaching.

3) The Board of Governors has already established and encouraged a large number of appropriate incentives for improving teaching apart from the personnel processes for retention, promotion, and tenure. Many of these are noted in this report. Many more are being instituted as the AB 1725 funds are being used on local campuses. We expect that well over half of the new $5 million staff development funds will go toward faculty and instructional improvement.

4) The Board of Governors has already submitted Budget Change Proposals which aim to raise the system funding for staff development up to 2% of general fund budgets—an increase that more than doubles 1987-88 spending up to approximately $40 million. The Board has also recommended that the

million annually. This report recommends further increases to establish a truly excellent staff development program for the California Community Colleges. We should increase the funds available to colleges by another $10 million so they could, on a matching funds basis, increase their local expenditures for staff development to 3%. Moreover, we recommend that the FII be expanded to $10 million annually—providing an additional 1/2% of general funds to support instructional innovation. Therefore the costs for the full implementation requested by ACR 39 is $70 million in 1990-91:

$20 million in local funds (about what would have been spent without AB 1725)
$20 million in new state categorical funding (to raise colleges to the 2% general fund level)
$10 million in new state funds (to allow some colleges to raise their staff development funding to 3% on a 1:1 matching basis)
$10 million in local college matching funds
$10 million for the annual Fund for Instructional Improvement

$70 million total per year

This annual amount should be increased for cost of living.

This recommendation provides four important incentives to increase undergraduate teaching:

1) funding up to the recommended 2% level for all of our college staff development programs on a formula basis,
2) incentives to invest more local money into staff development through the matching funds,
3) $5 million per year to stimulate local college instructional innovations through the Fund for Instructional Improvement, and
4) an additional $5 million in the FII to fund the Board's statewide instructional innovation initiatives and priorities.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There is no "Reference" section in this report. Most of the *printed* references have been attached to the report in the final section. The remaining background documents were listed as references in *those* attachments.

This acknowledgement section, however, could just as well be titled References because the report could not have been completed without the important contributions of the individuals and groups listed.

We still hope for full funding of the grant that supported this study. That will enable us to conduct a major, comprehensive study of faculty development in our 107 colleges. It will also allow us to do a more complete and creative job of helping new local staff development committees identify and complete their tasks.

The following list notes the groups which provided input for this study/report in rough chronological order since the grant was written last Spring. They provided many ideas, editorial advice, and professional support -- many more than once.

- The Northern California Staff Development Group
- The Southern California Staff Development Group
- Participants in our Faculty Development presentation at the National Institute for Staff and Organization Development
- Chancellor's Office and "Field" BCP Drafters
- Foothill College Teachers of Tomorrow
- Academic Senate participants in Staff Development and Teaching Effectiveness workshops
- Foothill-De Anza Great Teaching Seminar participants
- Learning professionals at a "Master Student" conference
- American Council on Education seminar participants
- Faculty developers at El Paso Community College - winner of the NCSPOD 1987-88 Award for Excellence in Staff Development
- California Great Teachers Seminar 1988
- California Great Teachers Reunion/Renewal 1988
- National Council for Staff Professional and Organizational Development President and Past-President
- Professional Development Academy of CACC
- Chief Instructional Officers of California Community Colleges, especially their Board of Directors
- Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, especially their Executive Committee
- AS/CIOs - the synergistic leadership group connecting the previous two units
- Academic Senate Faculty Development Committee
- CACC Staff Development Workshop participants

- California Community College Chancellor's Office Staff Development Colleagues
- 4C/SD - California Community College Council for Staff Development
- Western Regional Directors of NCSPOD
- The California Community College Chancellor's Cabinet

This report was reviewed by over 60 of the top staff development professionals in the California Community Colleges. There has been nearly unanimous support for the recommendations noted herein by the staff development, Academic Senate, and Instructional Officers in the field. Nevertheless, where one hundred percent agreement did not exist, the author had to make a judgment and takes full responsibility for so doing.

RESOURCE MATERIALS

The following resource materials were used in the preparation of this report:

1. ACR 39 - Incentives for Improving Undergraduate Education
2. AB 1725 - Staff and Faculty Development Excerpts
3. Berman, Weiler Report - Exploring Faculty Development in Higher Education
4. CPEC Report - State Policy for Faculty Development in California Public Higher Education
5. Southern California Staff Development Officers Consortium Position Paper - Staff Development for the Nineties
6. Chancellor's Memo - Faculty and Staff Development
7. AS/CIO Letter - AB 1725 Staff Development Funding
8. Innovation Abstract - Instructional Skills Workshops
9. Flyer - Flex Calendar Description
10. Flyer - California Great Teachers Seminar
11. Flyer - Fund for Instructional Improvement
12. Description - Matriculation in the California Community Colleges
13. Flyer - Foothill College Teaching Resource Center
14. Monograph - Chancellor's Office Report on Successful Teaching Strategies: Instruction for Black and Hispanic Students in the California Community Colleges
15. Description - Professional Development Academy Organization
16. Recommendations - Professional Development Academy Human Resources Plan Suggestions
17. Monograph - California Faces/California's Future - Jt. Legislative Committee to Review the Master Plan for Higher Education (2nd Draft), 1988

18. Monograph - Beyond Assessment: Enhancing the Learning and Development of California's Diverse Students - CPEC

19. Research Report - Institutional Effectiveness - CACC

20. Faculty Development Suggestions - League for Innovation in the Community College

21. Professional Achievement Awards - Foothill-De Anda Community College District

22. Budget Change Proposal for Staff and Faculty Development

23. Budget Change Proposal for Fund for Instructional Improvement

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges APR 07 1989